

REMARKS

Claim rejections 35 USC §112

The cited rejections are believed overcome by the present amendment to the claims.

The specific initiators are introduced into the independent claim, and the order of mixing is specified in that the “first solution” and the “second solution” will by definition have been separately prepared before being mixed together into the claimed formulation.

Claim rejections 35 USC §102

In Kurahashi, the two formulations are applied in separate, consecutive steps, and are never mixed into a single solution (see col 4, line 9-14). This is consistent with the predjudice in the art that the two types of solutions do not mix well into a single treatment formulation as claimed. Furthermore, the Furfuryl alcohol of Kurahashi is not initiated with maleic anhydride, as the FA in Kurahashi is merely used as an accelerator.

New claims 31 and 32 are believed patentable over Kurahashi, as the reference discloses at col 2, line 52 that the plastic impregnation is not uniform. Further more, the FA in Kurahashi is not disclosed as polymerized into an FA polymer, much less a polymer that would enter the cell walls at a uniform level of penetration as the styrene polymer. AT Col 4, lines 31-42 Kurahashi only discloses that the wood in impregnated by a plastic polymer.

Claim rejections 35 USC §103

It is respectfully believed that the examiner has misinterpreted the reading of the article attributed to the inventor. The examiner asserts that article discloses the use of methyl methacrylate, however the current claims are directed to styrene. The article does not teach or suggest that initiated styrene could be mixed with initiated FA. Methyl methacrylate and styrene are significantly different compounds, and the miscibility of initiated styrene with initiated FA cannot be extrapolated from the disclosure of the article. Nor does the article teach the claimed order of mixing.